



87w



Docket No.: 213591US2SRD PCT

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

ECKHARD H. KUESTERS
(703) 413-3000
EKUESTERS@OBLON.COM

RE: Application Serial No.: 09/914,787
Applicants: Takeshi NAGAI, et al.
Filing Date: September 5, 2001
For: VIDEO CODING APPARATUS AND VIDEO
DECODING APPARATUS
Group Art Unit: 2613
Examiner: DIEP, N.

SIR:

Attached hereto for filing are the following papers:

PROVISIONAL ELECTION

Our check in the amount of \$0.00 is attached covering any required fees. In the event any variance exists between the amount enclosed and the Patent Office charges for filing the above-noted documents, including any fees required under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 for any necessary Extension of Time to make the filing of the attached documents timely, please charge or credit the difference to our Deposit Account No. 15-0030. Further, if these papers are not considered timely filed, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 for the necessary extension of time. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Eckhard H. Kuesters

Registration No. 28,870

Customer Number

22850

(703) 413-3000 (phone)
(703) 413-2220 (fax)

DOCKET NO: 213591US



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

IN RE APPLICATION OF :
TAKESHI NAGAI ET AL : EXAMINER: DIEP, N.
SERIAL NO: 09/914,787 :
FILED: SEPTEMBER 5, 2001 : GROUP ART UNIT: 2613
FOR: VIDEO CODING APPARATUS AND :
VIDEO DECODING APPARATUS

PROVISIONAL ELECTION

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313

SIR:

In response to the election requirement dated February 10, 2005, Applicants provisionally elect with traverse the species of Figure 1, for further examination on the merits. Applicant identifies Claims 1, 2, 4, 23 and 30 as readable on the elected species. Applicants reserve the right to file one or more divisional applications directed to the non-elected species.

Furthermore, while the Election Requirement asserts that the application contains claims to patentably distinct species, MPEP § 803 states the following:

If the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the Examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to distinct or independent inventions.


Although the outstanding Official Action does not identify search classifications, it is believed that the claims of the present application would have to be searched in a handful of sub-classes. Furthermore, since electronic searching is commonly performed, a search may

be made of a large number of, or theoretically all, subclasses without substantial additional effort. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully traverse the Election Requirement on the grounds that a search and examination of the entire application would not place a *serious* burden on the Examiner, whereas it would be a serious burden on Applicants to prosecute and maintain separate applications.

Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the requirement to elect a single species be withdrawn, and that a full examination on the merits of Claims 1, 2, 4, 7-9, 11, 17, 19-24 and 27-47 be conducted.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Eckhard H. Kuesters
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 28,870

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/03)

I:\ATTY\EHK\AMEND-RESPONSES\0039\21s\213591US-PE.DOC